



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/757,745	01/10/2001	John Rozen	11125-017001	8043
26161	7590	09/28/2006		EXAMINER
FISH & RICHARDSON PC P.O. BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022				BARQADLE, YASIN M
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2153	

DATE MAILED: 09/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/757,745	ROZEN, JOHN	
	Examiner Yasin M. Barqadle	Art Unit 2153	
--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --			
THE REPLY FILED 07 September 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.			
<p>1. <input type="checkbox"/> The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:</p> <p>a) <input type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p> <p>b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p> <p>Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).</p>			
<p>Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</p>			
NOTICE OF APPEAL			
<p>2. <input type="checkbox"/> The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).</p>			
AMENDMENTS			
<p>3. <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because</p> <p>(a) <input type="checkbox"/> They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</p> <p>(b) <input type="checkbox"/> They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</p> <p>(c) <input type="checkbox"/> They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or</p> <p>(d) <input type="checkbox"/> They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.</p> <p>NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).</p>			
<p>4. <input type="checkbox"/> The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).</p> <p>5. <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.</p> <p>6. <input type="checkbox"/> Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</p>			
<p>7. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) <input type="checkbox"/> will not be entered, or b) <input type="checkbox"/> will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.</p> <p>The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:</p> <p>Claim(s) allowed: _____.</p> <p>Claim(s) objected to: <u>None</u>.</p> <p>Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-3, 5-8 and 10-14</u>.</p> <p>Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>None</u>.</p>			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<p>8. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</p> <p>9. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).</p> <p>10. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.</p>			
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
<p>11. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></p> <p>12. <input type="checkbox"/> Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____</p> <p>13. <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____</p>			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues "the Examiner has thus far failed to explain why it was clear error for Examiner Klinger to have mapped Hasebe's local unit 200 to the claimed 'origin server.'"(page 2 paragraph 5 of the remarks). In response, the Examiner has acted in accordance with the rules set forth in the MPEP. The examiner has not taken an entirely new approach or attempt to reorient the point of view of the previous examiner nor has he conducted a new search in mere hope of finding something. The examiner has carefully analyzed the Hasebe and has come to the determination that Hasebe discloses sufficient information to formulate a rejection under 102. Applicant also agrees that "...Applicant also agrees that the network exchange device 20 receives a request from the user terminal device 10. However, Applicant disagrees with the proposition that such request is in any way a request for 'desired content'" (page 3, paragraph 3). Examine notes that Hasebe teaches "The user communication terminal 10 has a function for issuing a request to the information distribution device 80 so that a user can obtain information from a communication network. The information distribution device 60 has a function for transmitting and providing information upon receiving a request from the user terminal device 10, a function for relaying information such as video, speech, text, etc. in real time, and a function for storing information transmitted from the user" Clearly the request made by the terminal includes among other things a desired information such video, speech, text, etc.. Applicant also argues that "The Examiner appears to regard the Hasebe exchange devices as both routers and origin servers." Exminer notes the Applicant's claim 6 is directed to content servers, origin server and a first router and a second router for relaying messages to content servers. Hasebe shows plurality of devices including an device 20 (an origin server), content servers 60 and routers 40A-40B. See fig. 8. Therefore Examiner's interpretation matchs Applicant's argued limitations..

ABDULRAHMAN SALAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER